Remarks

1. Claim Status

Claims 1-10 and 12-38 remain pending with claims 1, 16, 26, and 34 being

independent

2. Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 recites a network interface that initiates DMA (Direct Memory Access)

transfer of statistics metering operation of the network interface. As amended, claim 1

further recites that the circuitry initiates the DMA transfer based on a data specifying a

time interval.

The Final Office Action rejected claim 1 as obvious in view Boucher (U.S.

6,434,620). Boucher does not describe initiating a transfer based on "data specifying a

time interval". Boucher describes a request/response system where statistics are

transmitted in response to a UPR (Utility Processor Request) (col. 56, lines 18-33).

That is, in response to a given UPR, the INIC will transfer a set of statistics.

The Final Office Action argued that it would have been obvious to modify

Boucher to use a time-slot scheme to transfer network statistics, instead of the

response/request scheme described, to prevent DMA transfers from conflicting with

other system functions/components. However, the Final Office Action does not identify

anything in Boucher, or any other reference, that identifies conflicts with other system

functions/components that the UPR scheme creates, let alone conflicts that would be

prevented by a time-slot scheme.

As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims. Independent claims 16, 26, and 34 also recite "data specifying a time interval". For at least the reasons above, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 16, 26, and 34 and their corresponding dependent claims as well.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/5/07   /Robert A. Greenberg/

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200